

REMARKS

This patent application presently includes Claims 1-15 and 21-25, of which Claims 6, 7, 9, 10, 24 and 25 are allowed. Claim 8 was objected to, and Claims 1-5, 11-15, and 21-23 were rejected. The drawings and description are amended to correct inadvertent errors. Claim 1 is amended for clarity, and all rejections are respectfully traversed.

The drawings were objected to for specific reasons stated in the Office Action. Under separate cover, the undersigned is enclosing copies of the drawing pages containing Figs. 1, 4, 11 and 13, in which proposed drawing corrections are shown in red. It is respectfully requested that the examiner approve these drawing amendments.

The examiner objected to Figs. 1 and 2, stating that they should be indicated as "Prior Art." This correction has been made.

The drawings were also objected to for failing to show the reference character "110." This reference character now appears in the amended version of Fig. 5.

The drawings were also objected to because the reference character "16" was used to designate different parts, the examiner referring specifically to Fig. 4. The proposed drawing correction for Fig. 4 moves the arrow for the reference character 16 to point at the right end of the PCB 16. This objection should be now be withdrawn.

The examiner also objected to the drawings, because the reference characters "16" and "112" have both been used to designate the PCB. In Figs. 11 and 12, as amended, the reference character "112" has been changed to "16." Accordingly, this objection should now be withdrawn.

The drawings were also objected to for including the reference character "116" in Fig. 15, which was not mentioned in the description. In Fig. 15, as amended, the reference character "116" has been changed to "16", so the drawings are now consistent throughout. Since the reference character "116" no longer appears in the drawings, this objection should be withdrawn.

The examiner also objected to the specification, owing to a number of typographical errors in reference characters appearing at Page 12 of the application. With the present amendment, "15" at Line 6 has been changed to "18"; "14" at Line 21 has been changed to "15"; and "4" at Line 22 has been change to "14." Since all errors noted by the examiner have now been corrected, this objection should be withdrawn.

The examiner also objected to the specification for failing to provide a proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter, referring specifically to "the second bump electrically connected to the printed circuit" (Line 8 of Claim 1). This will be discussed further with respect to Claim 1 below. However, for the reasons explained below with respect to the rejection of Claim 1, it is believed that this objection should also be withdrawn.

Claim 8 was objected to owing to the lack of an antecedent basis for "the flexible PCB." As suggested by the examiner "flexible" has now been deleted, so that this objection should now be withdrawn.

Claims 1-5, 11-15 and 21-23 were rejected for failing to comply with the written description requirement. The examiner asserted that these claims contained subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the invention was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Specifically, the examiner referred to the language in Claim 1 involving "the second bump electrically connected to the printed circuit."

In the present amendment, Claim 1 has been amended for clarity in a number respects. First of all, "printed circuit" at Line 8 has been changed to "circuit of the PCB." This, however, is not an amendment, as it simply restores this limitation to the form it had prior to the last amendment.

It will be noted that Claim 1 has also been amended at Line 2, to insert "and having a circuit." This was done in order to provide an antecedent basis for "the circuit" at Line 9. In addition, Claim 1 was amended to change "upper" to "first." This was done for clarity, since the

claim does not define what is up or down in the module of the claim. Moreover, up or down ultimately depends on the direction in which the module is oriented and used. Accordingly, the use of the term "upper" was believed to be unclear and has been deleted. It is noted that this could be interpreted as a broadening, but it is not believed to affect the claim substantively. As amended, Claim 1 defines the invention as described, for example, at Page 10, Lines 15-19 of the application. Accordingly, this rejection should now be withdrawn, and Claim 1 should be allowed.

The examiner gave no separate basis for the rejection of Claims 4-5, 11-15, and 21-23. Accordingly, these claims should now be allowed.

Applicant's attorney has made every effort to place this patent application in condition for allowance. It is therefore earnestly requested that this application, as a whole, receive favorable reconsideration and that all of the claims be allowed as presently constituted. Should there remain any unanswered questions, the examiner is requested to call the applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number given below.

Dated: June 21, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joseph B. Lerch

Registration No.: 26,936

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(212) 527-7700

(212) 753-6237 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant